Remarks

These remarks respond to the Final Office Action mailed October 15, 2007. Claims 1-26 are pending in application. Claims 1 and 26 are presented in independent form. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 8-23, and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,615,281 to Yamaguchi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,211 to Bormans et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the present application recites, among other elements, "creating a frame group table" with an entry for each pixel which "includes a dominant pixel color component... for each pixel." Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out the invention. The combination of Yamaguchi and Bormans fails to teach or suggest this element.

Yamaguchi is directed to a method for generating a reduced image. The system in Yamaguchi creates a reduced image which is a "clear and complete" reproduction of an original image (abstract). Representative pixels are extracted from an image to create the reduced image. Once the reduced image is created, the system in Yamaguchi has achieved its goal.

The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 6-15 of Yamaguchi as disclosing the element of a "frame group table" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. This portion of Yamaguchi recites the creation of a priority group table that includes codes indicating an order of priority for pixels in an image. One example of a priority group table is depicted in Fig. 6 of Yamaguchi where C1, C2, and C3 are color codes arranged in order of priority. When a pixel is read from an image,

the color codes of the pixel are compared to the color codes in the priority code table (col. 5, lines 48-59). The priority codes are used to determine whether a particular pixel should be used as a representative of a set of pixels (col. 5, lines 49-60).

The invention recited in claim 1 of the present application recites a "frame group table" in which each pixel entry "includes a dominant pixel color component." One embodiment of a frame group table is depicted in Fig. 3A of the present application in which each pixel has a dominant color value. Yamaguchi does not teach or suggest any table with a "dominant pixel color component" for each pixel in an image.

Bormans fails to remedy this deficiency. The Examiner does not point to, nor does Bormans teach or suggest, "creating a frame group table" with a "dominant pixel color component" for each pixel. Thus, the combination of Yamaguchi and Bormans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-25 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and thus incorporate the limitations of claim 1. Because Yamaguchi and Bormans, alone or in any known combination, fail to teach or suggest "creating a frame group table" as recited in claim 1, dependent claims 2-25 are not obvious over Yamaguchi in view of Bormans.

Independent claim 26 of the present application also recites "creating a frame group table" as discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Thus, because Yamaguchi and Bormans, alone or in any known combination, do not teach or suggest "creating a frame group table"

In addition, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Yamaguchi with the teachings of Bormans because the two references have completely opposite goals. The purpose of Yamaguchi is to create a "reduced image" which is a "clear and complete reproduction of the original image" (abstract). Yamaguchi achieves this by extracting representative pixels which constitute a reduced image (col. 5, lines 7-11). The reduced image is never expanded in any way. Conversely, the purpose of Bormans of compressing digital data, not reducing it (col. 1, lines 11-14). The purpose of the compression is economic storage, analysis, and transmission of visual data (col. 1, lines 21-24). The data is then decoded, or decompressed at a later time (col. 17, lines 47-64). Thus, the purpose of Yamaguchi is completely different than the purpose of Bormans and one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the references.

It would, in fact, be impossible to combine the teachings of Yamaguchi with the teachings of Bormans because once an image has been reduced according to the systems described in Yamaguchi, there is no way to decompress, or decode, the image according to Bormans. The systems in Yamaguchi generate a reduced image based on selected pixels and discards the rest of the pixels. Bormans compresses and decodes all pixels. One skilled in the art would not be able to decompress or decode an image which has been reduced according to the systems described in Yamaguchi.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-16, 19, and 22 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Bormans in view of U.S. Patent Application Serial No.

10/770,952. Applicant has included a terminal disclaimer with this response. Applicant

respectfully asserts that this disclaimer overcomes this rejection.

Conclusion

As Applicant asserts that each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been

fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If, however, for

any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is

respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' attorney at (973) 912-7177 in order to

expedite allowance of the application.

Dated: March 17, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

/ Matthew E. Hanley / _____
Registration No.: 51,773
For Tarek N. Fahmi (41,402)
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000
Attorney for Applicant